

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application in light of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### **Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claim 14 has been amended. No new matter has been added. The amendment to claim 14 is of an idiomatic English nature to more affirmatively recite that the antenna port is part of the radio device; such amendment not changing the scope of claim 14.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the Examiner's allowance of claim 14, and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 4 and 10.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2, 8 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,252,552 to Tarvas et al. ("Tarvas '552") Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Examiner states, at page 8, lines 1-5, that the "[f]eed conductor can be considered a conductive part of the radio device, and as disclosed in column 7, lines 8-14, part of connection of the feedpoint to the antenna port is a coupling through the printed circuit board, interpreted as galvanically isolated since electrical contact is not formed."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiners above-quoted interpretation of the reference. Tarvas '552 clearly describes at column 6, lines 38-40 that "a galvanic contact must be provided between the ground coupling pad 1104 and the planar radiating element 1101 . . . ." Although Tarvas '552 describes at column 7, lines 15 and 16 that "the same connector

block provides the connection between the ground contact 1208 and ground plane 1202,” Tarvas ‘552 neither discloses, nor suggests, that the connector block makes such connection in a galvanically isolated manner.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action the Examiner contends that Tarvas ‘552 discloses a radiating element that is galvanically isolated from ground, and cites Tarvas ‘552, column 1, lines 43-46. Applicants submit that the cited passage merely states that “[t]he antenna is fed through a coupling element 205 which does not touch the radiating element 201.” The Examiner has ignored the disclosure of the immediately prior sentence, which states “wherein a radiating element 201, ground plane 202, and a ground contact 203 interconnecting these two are realized as metal platings on surfaces of a solid dielectric body 204.” (Tarvas ‘552, column 1, lines 40-43.) Clearly, ground contact 203 galvanically interconnects Tarvas ‘552’s radiating element with other conductive parts. A short-circuit conductor corresponding to ground contact 203 exists in every embodiment disclosed in Tarvas ‘552.

Independent claims 1 and 13 recite “a radiating element **galvanically isolated** from other conductive parts of the radio device.” (Emphasis added.) In contrast, Tarvas ‘552 discloses a coupled feed and a galvanically contacted ground at the planar radiating element, and is silent as to any disclosure of a galvanically isolated contact. Thus, each and every element of claims 1 and 13 are not disclosed by Tarvas ‘552. Therefore, Tarvas ‘552 does not anticipate claims 1 and 13. Claims 2 and 8 depend from claim 1, and also distinguish over the reference for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 5-7, 9 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarvas '552 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,469,673 to Kaiponen. Claim 12 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Tarvas '552 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,759,989 to Tarvas et al. ("Tarvas '989"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Examiner relies on Kaiponen as disclosing: a radiating element which follows the surface shape of a radio device; a radiating element that is a rigid conductive piece belonging to a radio device cover; and an antenna attached to the non-conductive portions of a radio device. The Examiner contends that the combination of Tarvas '552 and Kaiponen results in the claimed invention. However, Kaiponen neither discloses nor suggests those features of dependent claims 5-7, 9 and 11 demonstrated above to be missing from Tarvas '552 with respect to their base claim. Therefore, Applicant submits that the combination of Tarvas '552 and Kaiponen neither discloses nor suggests the invention of claims 5-7, 9 and 11. Thus, the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The Examiner relies on Tarvas '989 as disclosing placement of a parasitic element to improve an upper operating band. The Examiner contends that the combination of Tarvas '552 and Tarvas '989 results in the claimed invention. However, Tarvas '989 neither discloses nor suggests those features of dependent claim 12 demonstrated above to be missing from Tarvas '552 with respect to its base claim. Therefore, Applicant submits that the combination of Tarvas '552 and Tarvas '989 neither discloses nor suggests the invention of claim 12. Thus, the Examiner has failed to meet the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

### CONCLUSION

Each and every point raised in the Office Action dated April 18, 2006 has been addressed on the basis of the above amendments and remarks. In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-14 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Dated: July 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Richard J. Katz  
Reg. No. 47,698  
Attorney for Applicant

DARBY & DARBY, P.C.  
Post Office Box 5257  
New York, N.Y. 10150-5257  
Phone: (212) 527-7700